

held her Council by herself. The function then of Romanism seems to be that of a *Diaboli Advocatus*, the accuser of the brethren, to mar the Body of the Christ, and to enlarge and expose the wounds thereon. "Satan's warfare on the Human part of the Godman did not cease at Calvary. As Satan nailed Him to the cross, so he follows Him, with mighty smitings, through the centuries. And Rome's fond idea that Christ's Body is something that cannot possibly show such ghastly wounds as non-inter-communion, which she enforces between Its parts, or such bruises as a fundamental alteration in Its governmental structure, is but a Utopian dream. It is to forget the swollen back, the bones stretched out of joint, the nails, the thorns, the spear."

To sum up then, the system (1) the supreme ambition of which is that of an inordinate love and grasp of power, both spiritual and temporal; (2) which defines and decrees, belying Scripture and the testimony of the ages, curses and fears not; (3) the ethical code of which has been exposed by more than one of its own doctors in days gone by as unscriptural and immoral, and which carries with and leaves behind it impressions of falsity; this, in its complicated and unsavory detail, is Romanism, and upon this the Catholic System of all Christendom, while keeping on its own steadfast way, looks in sorrow and amazement.

"Let thine eyes look right on, and let thine eyelids look straight before thee; turn not to the right hand nor to the left."

VIA MEDIA.

THE

CATHOLIC SYSTEM *versus* ROMANISM.

AN OCCASIONAL SERMON,

PREACHED IN S. LUKE'S CHURCH, GERMANTOWN, PHILA.

BY THE RECTOR, THE

REV. SAMUEL UPJOHN, S. T. D.

FIRST SUNDAY IN LENT,

February 23, 1890.

NEW YORK:

JAMES POTT & CO.,
12 Astor Place.

1890.

THE SERMON.

Let thine eyes look right on, and let thine eyelids look straight before thee—

Turn not to the right hand nor to the left.—Prov. iv, 25-27.

That of which I propose to speak this afternoon, is the Catholic System, as opposed to or distinguished from Romanism. That of which I propose (God willing) to speak, two weeks from this afternoon, is the Catholic System as opposed to or distinguished from Protestantism. The two topics more or less interlace each other. But mainly they may be kept separate, and this I shall endeavor to do in the treatment of them. They are large topics, extending over a wide range of ground, involving a notice of history, doctrine, and devotion or ritual. I shall try on these occasions to relieve the treatment of them from being too formidable, either in length, depth, or complexity. And still with my best efforts in this direction I must ask your indulgence to my defects. I would enlist your interest if possible, your sympathy if I may be so fortunate, your patience, if for this there be necessity. And if asked, why speak upon these subjects at all? I would ask in return, “Is there not a cause?” Are not these the things which in some form or other are facing us all the while? The Catholic System, Romanism, Protestantism. The names we hear often, the things for which the names stand we know are realities. Do

we know adequately what the things or the names mean? I may presume they all touch us in some way, we are all affected by them, by the love of them or by the dread of them. We know of them or are suspicious of them as the case may be. We cannot be said, therefore, to be indifferent to them. It may do us good to know something possibly, more than we know already.

Let us attend then. And first, it will be well for us to define a little. What do we mean by the terms Catholic, Romanism, Protestantism? Probably we all have some idea of what these names signify. It will not be superfluous, however, to say a word with reference to each of them.

Catholic means "over the whole," or as we generally term it, universal. We say in the creed, "Catholic Church," and we mean by this title that Society which Jesus the Christ as the great Head of the Church, originated, framed and sent into the world. This Society was for the whole world, all mankind, hence Catholic in its extension. It was a complete organism, having, that is, all things essential to its own order, and to the purpose for which it was ordained. Its Head is the Christ, its governing powers and agents are its commissioned officers, its bishops, priests and deacons, and other lesser orders, but its essential orders are confined to its ministry. In this respect it is Catholic, suited, that is, for universal extension and perpetuation and for all kinds of work. Then, also, it is in possession of all necessary truth. It carries with it the "whole counsel of God," whatever the Head, even the Christ has

said, and given as a body of instruction to be believed. This truth covers all needs and treats of all things necessary to know concerning God, ourselves and our duty. And this truth shows itself under the Catholic System in word and in act, in thought and in outward form, and as such, appeals to the soul, the thinking and spiritual mind, and through the senses. Hence the institutions of this Society, its sacraments and worship, these also are Catholic, because universally necessary, meeting the common needs of human nature.

The Catholic System, then, is that system of faith of order, of authority and form which originating in the Christ and His Apostles, and filled with the Holy Ghost, is to be found one and the same in all their essential features, *in all times, everywhere, and among all.* "Christian is my name," says S. Pacian, "Catholic is my surname," "and no Christian man and no Christian body can, without shame, make any other confession. But the only pledge of Catholicity which the individual or particular Church can have lies in dutiful deference to the authority of the Church at large."

Now this system has extended down to us from the Christ and His Apostles, and from the earliest witnesses, for the Christ, under and among whom it grew into its complete form, with its doctrines, ministry, sacraments and worship. There has always, therefore, been a Catholic System, always the means of identifying it from anything that was not really itself; on the one hand, from that which claims to be Catholic, but exceeds the Catholic standard, and, on

the other hand, from anything which falls short of it by defect.

When then, we mention Romanism, we name a system of teaching and practice, which is not original with the Catholic System, but which, in the course of the long period that the Catholic System has existed, has gradually accumulated, and attached itself to that which is the original and pure. Romanism takes its name from Rome, and describes not the Catholic Church, but that which has emanated from a local Church, which also became for a long while so predominant as to give its name, together with the word Catholic, to the Christianity of Western Europe. By Romanism we mean, not the Catholic Church as such, to which Rome has no exclusive claim, but the accretions, the usurpations, additions to and corrections of the faith, which Rome, through her great influence as a political and ecclesiastical centre, has been guilty of imposing upon her otherwise Catholic System. It is a not uncommon mistake to attribute to Rome the credit of originating and perpetuating the Catholic Church. Rome was, and has been, indeed, a chief seat of the Catholic Church from the Apostles' times, but she was and is not the only seat. There were and are other great sees, or bishoprics. These were equally great, if not equally influential, for a long time; her sister churches who, in common with her, and on an ecclesiastical par with her, maintained the Catholic Religion of Jesus the Christ. The fact that the Catholic Religion of Europe came, under her dominance which it did from the seventh century, was owing to the prominence of the city of

Rome as a political centre. But in proportion to her uncatholic claims and her usurpations over and above other sees, so far from advancing the cause of the true and uncorrupt Catholic Religion, she injured and debased it. Whatever service then, the Church did for Europe and civilization through the centuries, she rendered, not in her Roman, but in her Catholic character and capacity. Therefore, in speaking, as some do, and as recently a writer has, a wrong impression is given. Thus a notable divine of New York city is represented as making the following statement: "But for the Roman Catholic Church the modern world would have been an impossibility." It is to be observed that the misuse of language in this statement lies in the title "Roman." It was not Romanism that "preserved what little there was of culture," but the Catholic Religion, and the Catholic Religion did not originate in or with Rome, nor was it confined to Romish leadership that the Catholic faith was preserved to the nations. Romanism, which has for centuries disgraced the name of Catholic, retarded rather than furthered progress. The Catholic System, whether in the Church of Rome or in the Church of England, was the "nursing mother of humanity," and the Catholic System belongs not to Rome exclusively, but to the Catholic Churches of Christendom, the heritage of the undivided Church. Romanism, therefore, is a term which describes Rome's perversion of the trust committed to her. Romanism gave rise to the convulsions, religious and political, of the sixteenth century,—the crisis in the religious experience of Western Europe,

which manifested both the fact and tendency on the part of Rome to apostasize from the original and undefiled Catholic standards. It made evident that Rome's Romanism was stronger and dearer to her than her Catholicity. In that movement the Catholic System, in England (though by an agency not without its discreditable features, largely the result of Romanism), wrenched itself away from Romanism. In England, the Catholic Church, long vexed by it, at length abjured Romanism. Catholic she had always been, and in discarding Romanism she did not cease to be Catholic. She maintained herself as an integral branch of the one continuous, visible Catholic Church.

A very popular error eagerly fostered by Roman propagandists, is that the Catholic Church ceased to exist in England when the usurpations of the Bishop of Rome were thrown off in the sixteenth century. This impression is directly contrary to the facts of the case. The Church of England remained Catholic only without Romanism. And but for the Romish claims and corruptions the Church of England would have remained in communion with the Bishop of Rome. With her it was essential to be true to the integrity of her Catholic order and practice. This she could not sacrifice. She therefore, suffered herself to be excluded from communion with Rome, while she remained as ever, one with Catholic Christendom, and there she abides.

Romanism was no more necessary to her integrity and her identity with the Catholic Church of all ages, than was the Bishop of Rome's jurisdiction, early or late, in and over Antioch, Alexandria, or

Constantinople to the Catholic System of these Churches.

The mistake alluded to arises from the inclination of people to identify the Church of England with the Protestants of the Continent, simply because she, as they (but not after their manner), separated from Rome.

This then will lead me to a definition of the term Protestantism. The origin of the word Protestant was a purely local one. It was used by certain German princes in 1529, who protested against the Emperor for breaking an agreement. It took afterwards a more general sense, as applied to those who resisted the tyranny of Rome. And so far as the Catholic System antagonizes Romanism, it protests, just as it protests against every error.

Properly speaking, however, the term Protestantism is a name which describes "all those who have broken with the historic Church, all those who repudiate or think lightly of the essential features of the Catholic System, the original ministry, the Catholic creeds, the sacraments as necessary means and channels of grace," and Catholic worship. Of Protestantism it will fall in with my purpose to speak more at length on the next occasion.

Here then we have the Christianity of Western Europe and of this Western world, in three distinct parts. Of course this does not include all Christian Churches, for there is the Greek Church which consists of some 80,000,000 of souls and various smaller Catholic Churches in the East. But these three represent the divisions or classifications of that portion

of Christendom which it is material for us now to notice, viz. : the Catholic System, Romanism, and Protestantism.

Before proceeding to show in what particulars Romanism has infringed upon the true Catholicity of the Religion of the Great Head of the Church, and wherein this Church, with the Church of England, is not Romish but Catholic, it may be profitable for us to set these systems before ourselves somewhat pictorially. This may help us to see their respective relations, and to understand what happens from time to time between them. You will hold in mind, then, that all Christians belonged originally to the one undivided Church of Christ, which by its universal extension, its universal gifts, and its universal fitness to the needs of men, exhibited and proved its claim to be a Catholic System, that is, not local, not partial, not transitory, but for everywhere, for all, and forever.

Those Christians who lived in the undivided Church, are our fathers; we belong to them, they belong to us. What was theirs is also ours, unless we have thrown it away. At all events they are our fathers, and if it has turned out that any Christians now have corrupted what their fathers held, or if any Christians now have dealt untruly and thrown off in part or in whole what their fathers possessed, it will be well for us to understand it, and to know how to range them, as well as those who have retained in its integrity what our fathers enjoyed. We can conceive then our fathers, the fathers of the present Christian generation, in Europe and of this Western

world, as advancing along on one great highway the Catholic System, an unbroken body an undivided host. Starting from Christ and His apostles and proceeding as such in succeeding generations, and through the successive centuries, all holding the same doctrine, all belonging to the same fellowship or authority, all using the same sacraments, all worshiping after the same fashion, and all making for the same goal—the consummation of the Kingdom of Christ, the salvation of the world. So we, in our fathers went forward or came onward down towards the present. The highway was a broad one with room for all, and like all properly made roads, somewhat higher in the middle, and shelving at the sides, and with a ditch on either side, and beyond on either side a trackless plain and wilderness the dreary waste of doubt, of unbelief and of despair. As the host proceeds and marches along at the slow moving pace of time, the tendency of some is to get off to the left, and of some to incline to the right of the road. Some wander to the left into dissent as the early sects, and heresies and schism did, and get mixed up in the fetid ditch water, or wander away in the wilderness. And some, on the other hand, veer off to the right, as in some of the corrupt tendencies of the early Church. For the most part, however, the great body keep to the middle of the road, turning neither to the right hand nor to the left. Thus the host advances. The early centuries witness order, free from usurpation ; still there are those who, as time and opportunity suggest ambitious cravings, look askance for Roman imperialism, and

"Because you must not turn to the left, do not therefore turn to the right, but go straight on in the way marked out from the beginning for the Church to Walk in."—Dr. Littledale.

try to compass it. Political and ecclesiastical problems favoring the struggle for Romish supremacy, multiply, and buttressed by arrogant claims and false evidence go forward with more or less of success, through the tenth and centuries following, and with the Papal supremacy, Romanism gets its full swing. New doctrines crop out, corrupt practices get foothold, among them false devotions, mariolatry more or less pronounced, scholastic definitions of the Holy Eucharist, the denial of the chalice to the laity, purgatory, and an elaborate system of indulgences for the living, a wholesale traffic in behalf of the dead, exactions and taxation, and political absolutism being prominent through all. And so after this fashion the host on the highway inclines to the right hand, not without effort, indeed, to regain its normal place, as in the unsuccessful attempts at reform in the fifteenth century, until at length the sixteenth century is reached, the Reformation period, and the break comes. What then takes place? A division of the advancing column. Romanism had been dragging down to the right side. On the other hand, by a violent effort, headed by Luther, Melanchon, Calvin and others, part of the swaying column is marched off to the extreme left. This was the Continental Reformation, irregular, fragmentary, inorganic, uncatholic, but still intensely anti-Roman. And then by a slower process, by constitutional methods, by conservative hold upon the integrity of faith and order, yet not without deeds of violence and shame, England with her Catholic host abjures Romanism, the column on

the extreme right, discountenances Protestantism, the column on the extreme left, and takes the centre of the road, the original and normal place, holding on to the Catholic System of the Church, divested of false accretions in doctrine and practice on the one hand, and avoiding defects and fanatical protests on the other. Hence, the column which originally was one column becomes three columns, all with the intent of reaching the same goal, but each divided from the other. The part which wants to be Romish keeps well over to the right. The part which wants to be Protestant keeps over to the left. The part that wants to be Catholic, Catholic nothing more and nothing less, keeps to the middle; the only place which the Catholic System could or can occupy. As the wise preacher indicates: "Let thine eyes look right on, and let thine eyelids look straight before thee; turn not to the right hand nor to the left."

This is what actually happened, this is what is elaborately described in history. The Catholic System is *Via Media*, not from being a compromise, but because the middle way is between the two extremes. The Catholic System takes no self-chosen position, but the place appointed by the Head and Captain of the Host. If others adhere not to her position, this is their lookout, and they must answer for it. Now look at the situation so constituted. The three systems run along side by side, the Romish on the right slope of the road, the Protestant on the left slope, with a ditch and the wilderness bordering each, the Catholic in the middle. Observe, then, between the Romish and the Catholic column a high

wall intervenes, built up by the former through the gradual accretions, stone upon stone, of doctrines added to the faith, and fixed there by anathemas, by false practices, growing out of doctrines, and more or less defaced, by the green mould and decaying matter of idolatry and superstition. Between the Protestant and the Catholic column a low wall intervenes, the necessary things, the essential terms of faith, and order, and practice, necessary to the preservation of the integral heritage and character of the Catholic System.

This being the situation, it is quite natural that these respective columns should be keeping a more or less sharp eye on one another. Romanism looks over into the Catholic column, and taunts it with the low wall dividing the Catholic from the Protestant. He says, "You think you are a Catholic, but you belong to the Protestant herd. Your low wall shows that." The Catholic blandly replies, "My wall, 'the faith once delivered,' is enough for me. It consists 'of these necessary things.' Yours, on the other hand, looks as though you had been 'wise above that which is written.'" In his turn the Protestant objects to the Catholic wall, and says, "You are exclusive. Why don't you take down your wall? We, on this side, hold to no such restrictions. We think and say and do very much as we please, 'every man that which is right in his own eyes.'" "Yes," the Catholic replies, "But is there not some little confusion over there. It seems to me I see some of your company slipping into the ditch of theological subtleties,

and, if I am not mistaken, a good many are wandering off into yonder bleak and open wild of doubt and disbelief.

Still, not all in the Catholic column are thus critical and wary. There are some who do not understand quite just where they are. They do not take in the significance of the high wall on the right, and others do not know the meaning of the low wall on the left. They do not understand the Catholic System. And here it is to be noted that many come from the Protestant side over the Catholic wall, and into the Catholic column. They are welcome, but from their number the notions and habits which they often bring with them they are not unlikely to give rise to no little confusion. The process of assimilation with Catholic doctrine and usage is slow. When, however, they come in, not to lead but to follow, then the result is a satisfactory one. Those on the other hand who come over the Romanist wall, have at least the merit of terms amenable to discipline. And again you will observe that as there are walls on each side of the Catholic position some provision must be made for—well, for purposes of drainage. Hence there are openings in the base of the walls on either side, and occasionally, here and there, one of the throng who is passing on the middle way is found looking rather curiously into these manholes, so to speak, and sometimes is, it may be unawares, swept through, finding themselves, before they know it, on the other side. Some pass through into the Protestant column, not liking the order and discipline of the Catholic System, wanting a free

rein for themselves. Some, on the other hand, drift into the Romish column, abandoning the reasonable and safe way of Catholic truth, lured on by the mystery and bigness of the thing, or by the great accounts of the goings on there. These accidents are the result of ignorance, of prejudice, of more or less of unsoundness, of fanaticism possibly, in one form or another.

It is an unhappy condition and an unhappy result for those who thus get entrapped, but on the whole, perhaps, in most cases it is just as well for the good of the Catholic column. It is a relief to any company to be rid of persistently dissatisfied and mutinous spirits. Those who thus slip off and under, continue "not with us, because they are not of us." Still, there are a few even out of this number who do not go off in this way, by the subterranean passages, but who get over by climbing up the wall on the side they incline to. Thus some mad spirits, impatient of the wholesome doctrine of the Word or of Catholic usage, fly with one leap over the wall into the side of dissent, dissent being in the line in which their minds habitually run. These are they who have taken as their motto, "The Bible and the Bible only," discarding the necessary "proportion of the faith," and the interpretation of Catholic tradition, which does not so much *sanction* as *witness* to the Divine Word and doctrine. Other souls are disquieted by the inconsistencies which sometimes are painfully apparent in the Catholic column, and so laboriously, painfully, and often with great reluctance, climb up the high wall on the right side. By irksome

effort they surmount the difficulties of Romanism, scraping hands and knees, and lacerating limbs, and tearing clothing on the ragged rocks of papal decrees and contradictory dogmas, and withal besmearing their garments with the unseemly slime of wretched superstition and doubtful morality. However, they get to the top and then are doubtful. On the one side, the voice says, "Come, come into the true Church and be saved, never mind about the scratches. We can teach you that they do not mean anything. We will instruct you how to be rid of those Catholic tests which you dwell too much upon. They have no place among us. We have one infallible remedy for that sort of thing. Just drop yourselves into our arms, and we will take care of you. 'The holy father' is sufficient for all these things. His word wipes out all difficulties." For you must know, brethren, that in Romanism "the Church crushes the individual, while in Protestantism the individual kills the Church. And he who perverts from the Catholic System to Romanism commits the sin of suicide. He lays himself beneath the wheels of the car of his Juggernaut." On the other hand, the would-be Romanizer as he poises himself on his giddy height, looking down into that abyss of self-extinction, hears often from his own side, not friendly voices, but hostile. Some thoughtless, uncatholic Christian seeing him in that doubtful position, instead of taking him by the hand, or reaching him by friendly look and sympathetic voice, exclaims, "that's where you are, is it, I thought so. You had better go where you belong, and 'good

riddance to bad rubbish.' We do not want you here, get out." And so over the unhappy creature goes. Meanwhile friendly hands greet him, and soft words soothe him, and perchance he feels that he has found "the haven where He would be." This is the way John Henry Newman went over to Rome. He was enticed, indeed, but more driven by the apparent inconsistencies of the unrevived Church, and by the real indiscretions and revilings of those whose allegiance and obligations to the Catholic System, should have taught them a better way. With him went over many, who did not stop to climb as he, but took the easier though less creditable way of the subterranean passages.

And now I will leave this parable of the road and these advancing columns for your consideration, it presents a view of relationship, and as such, I believe a right and true view.

It remains for me to point out, as briefly as I can, some of the points in which the Catholic System joins issue with Roman Catholicism and condemns it.

Before doing this, however, I will state in general the ground of the Catholic Faith, which Rome, in common with all other Catholic Churches occupies. The Catholic Faith is one everywhere, and but for Romanism would still bind* in visible communion Churches which, through her sin, have been and are now separated.

The chief points of agreement between Rome and the Catholic System are as follows: The acceptance of the Six General Councils of the first seven hundred and eighty years; holding the Nicene

Creed; having bishops, priests and deacons; the necessity of Apostolic Succession; Baptismal Regeneration; the fact but not the definition (1) of the Real Presence; (2) of the Eucharistic Sacrifice; Prayers for the Dead, though not as to Purgatory; a Ritual form of Worship. These are main features of the Catholic System, and, so far as faithfully adhered to, have produced in the Roman Communion her spirit of sacrifice, her power of achievement, her discipline and order, which in results (save where marred by evident Romanism) are great, beneficent, and of much genuine worth. And if, in her worship and ritual she has, to her own deep discredit, multiplied objects of devotion, and diverted its pure offering from the Divine Head of the Church, she has at the same time retained not a little of that which belongs in common to original and uncorrupt Catholic usage. The dignity and beauty of Divine worship, so far as she maintains it, is not her fault, but her excellence, as the heritage of the undivided Church. The Catholic System does not antagonize these things, for these things, pure and undefiled, are not Romanism. On the contrary, the Catholic System of to-day inherits these as a part of her patrimony, and exhorts her sons to administer it well and wisely, as in trust for the good of souls in every generation.

Points of agreement we gladly acknowledge; we are fain to multiply them. Taking them for what they are in nature and extent, they might well be sufficient to have held all who live under them in one communion and fellowship, the ample

basis of visible unity of concord and peace, and most of all for the testimony of the faith once delivered to the saints, "for the breaking down of the Kingdom of sin, Satan and death," and for the gathering together of the dispersed sheep, under the one fold and one Shepherd.

It is with reluctance, therefore, that we turn from what might and ought to be evidence of assured unity to the marks of disunion, and even of antagonism. The Catholic System of England and of America bemoans, but cannot ignore the fact that Romanism has overlaid and to a great degree frustrated her own Catholicity.

It will suffice on this occasion to mention some of the notes of Romanism, beginning with the most obvious, mischievous enough indeed, though perhaps, not the most formidable.

The following are some of the practical grievances of Romanism, which the Catholic System condemns,

1. The denial of the Chalice to the Laity, a mutilation of the Sacrament of the Holy Eucharist, a modern novelty, introduced in the twelfth century, and declared by (infallible?) Popes to be heretical. The Catholic System knows no such custom.

2. The necessity of the priest's intention to the validity of the sacraments. Romanism has determined (under pain of anathema to those who do not believe it) that a sacrament does not confer grace unless the priest mean it to do so, which decree has for its result this "desperate consequence," that the minister himself is the depository of grace, and can, even in the act of celebrating the sacraments,

withhold or confer grace at his will. Under this doctrine none, therefore, are sure of receiving the sacraments, or the benefit of them. The Catholic System knows no such heresy but to condemn it.

3. The doctrine of Purgatory, of late introduction, out of which has grown the Mass Traffic, the rich man, who pays the most money (though he be ever so much worse than the poor man, for whom little or no money can be paid) hereby being released the sooner from purgatorial pains, both physical and mental, the same, except in mere duration, with the pains of hell.

4. The Romish doctrine of Indulgences, based upon the superabundant merits of the cross, from which one (being fully forgiven) can draw, at the pleasure of the Pope, by means of "works of supererogation," and apply to himself, or transfer to others, living or dead. To the Catholic System this too, is abhorrent, and destructive of holiness and piety.

5. Mariolatry, or the Divine honors, and place ascribed to the Blessed Virgin, extensively and practically carried on, and giving rise to the Vatican decree of the Immaculate Conception, and hence to a change in the integrity of the doctrine of the Incarnation.

To these may be added without enlargement, among other practical grievances of Romanism, discouragement of the Holy Scriptures; and of Biblical Study among the Clergy; Creature worship; Divine Service in a dead Language; Falsification of the Fathers; The Cruelty and Intolerance of Romanism; and its Moral Failure.

And now to touch upon two points of difference between the Catholic System and Romanism, which are still more fundamental than any yet mentioned. Rome, on the subject of unity, holds the theory of exclusion, viz., that she alone is the Catholic Church, that whosoever is not in agreement with the Bishop of Rome is not in the Catholic Church at all. The true Catholic on the other hand, knows that this is an arrogant claim of Romanism. Catholicity embraces every communion which accepts the Nicene creed, the six General Councils, which has an apostolic ministry, and therefore the sacraments, and therefore sacramental life. Romanism, however, has come to be more and more, not inclusive, but exclusive. And so the Bishop of Rome has gone on a mad race, of anathematizing any and every communion which does not agree with him in every additional dogma, meanwhile and hereby putting himself more and more out of communion with Catholic Christendom. For to make terms of communion out of uncatholic dogmas is to cut oneself off from Catholicity, to make of the Church, a sect. Hence, here we have the spectacle of two Systems very diverse in origin and composition joining hands, viz., Presbyterianism, overlaying the faith with the multiplied subtleties of Calvinism (now felt to be an incubus), and Rome burdened with its self-imposed dogmas, which, by flaming anathemas, she has bound upon herself as a "body of death."

Finally, Romanism, by its well-known process of exclusion, entrenches itself behind the Supremacy, and the Infallibility of the Pope, risking all upon

this last cast. Under the shadow of this defence, Romanism is no longer troubled by the multitude of inconsistencies, contradictions, and lies, which lie heaped upon her neck deep. On the contrary, "she boasts herself in the multitude of her riches, and strengthens herself in her wickedness," Romanism puts aside Scripture, history, reason, conscience. To Romanism all external witnesses are equally matters of indifference, an intrusion and impertinence. "When the Bishop of Rome sent letters to the Patriarch of Constantinople, of a Catholic Church of eighty million of souls, inviting him to attend the Vatican Council in 1870, in declining the invitation for himself and his brother Bishops, and declining to open, or even lift from the table where the papal delegates have placed it, the elegant case, in which the invitation was enclosed, the venerable Patriarch expressed in the following words the fixed attitude of all parts of the Catholic Church, not in communion with the Papal See: 'Since it is manifest that there was a Church in existence ten centuries ago which held the same doctrine in the East as in the West, in the old or in the new Rome, let us each recur to that, and see which of us has added aught, which has diminished aught therefrom. And let all that may have been added be struck off, if any there be, and whatever it be, and let all that has been diminished therefrom be readded, if any there be, and whatever it be. And we shall all unawares find ourselves united in the same symbol of Catholic orthodoxy.'" Of course this was too Catholic an utterance for Romanism, and so Rome went and